

Notoph Gauge Theory as Hodge Theory

R.P.Malik ^{*} [†]*S. N. Bose National Centre for Basic Sciences,
Block-JD, Sector-III, Salt Lake, Calcutta-700 098, India*

Abstract: In the framework of an extended BRST formalism, it is shown that the four $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional (4D) free Abelian 2-form (notoph) gauge theory presents an example of a tractable field theoretical model for the Hodge theory.

^{*}E-mail address: malik@boson.bose.res.in

[†]Invited talk delivered in the **International Workshop** on “Supersymmetries and Quantum Symmetries” (**SQS '03**: 24-29 July, 2003) held at BLTP, JINR, Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia in memory of **Professor V. I. Ogievetsky** on the occasion of his 75th birth anniversary.

In their famous paper entitled “Notoph and Its Possible Interactions” (published in Russian [1] as well as in English [2]), Professor V. I. Ogievetsky (JINR, Dubna) and Professor I. V. Palubarinov (JINR, Dubna) coined the name “notoph” (i.e. the opposite of the 1-form Abelian gauge field “photon”) for the antisymmetric ($B_{\mu\nu} = -B_{\nu\mu}$) 2-form (i.e. $B = \frac{1}{2}(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)B_{\mu\nu}$) Abelian gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$. This antisymmetric field has turned out to be quite popular in the context of modern developments in the string theories and their close cousins D -branes. For instance, this field appears very naturally in the supergravity multiplets [3], the excited states of quantized (super)string theory [4] and its existence is crucial for the anomaly cancellation in the superstring theories [4,5]. Due to the presence of this field in the background, it turns out that the end points of the open strings become *noncommutative* when they are trapped on the D -branes. Thus, this field plays a crucial role in the modern upsurge of interest in the noncommutative geometry [6]. Besides these connections, this field and its corresponding gauge theory have been found to be relevant in the realm of cosmic string theory, vortices in an incompressible and irrotational liquid, QCD, “hairs” on the black holes, etc. [7-10]. It generates an effective mass for the photon field in 4D through a topological (i.e. celebrated $B \wedge F$) coupling term where the gauge invariance and mass co-exist without any recourse to the Higgs mechanism [11,12]. In addition, as is well-known, this antisymmetric massless Abelian field provides a dual description of the massless scalar field theory in the four dimensions of spacetime.

The purpose of our present note is to add, yet another, novel feather to the already richly feathered and beautifully studded cap of 2-form Abelian gauge field theory as discussed in the above paragraph in the context of its various connections and relevance to theoretical physics. We demonstrate that the free 4D Abelian 2-form gauge theory, in the framework of an extended Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formulation, provides a beautiful field theoretical model for the Hodge theory where all the de Rham cohomological operators (d, δ, Δ), the Hodge duality $*$ operation and the Hodge decomposition theorem [‡] etc., can be expressed in terms of the local, covariant and continuous symmetry transformations (and the corresponding generators) for the BRST- and dual(co)-BRST invariant Lagrangian density of the theory. In the realm of BRST cohomology, it is a common folklore to identify the conserved ($\dot{Q}_b = 0$) and nilpotent ($Q_b^2 = 0$) BRST charge Q_b (that generates a local, covariant, continuous and nilpotent symmetry transformations for the Lagrangian density of a given gauge theory) with the nilpotent ($d^2 = 0$) exterior derivative $d = dx^\mu \partial_\mu$ of differential geometry. It has been a *long-standing problem* to explore the possibility of identifying $\delta, *, \Delta$ with some interesting symmetry properties of the Lagrangian density of a given gauge theory so that one can obtain a field theoretical model for the Hodge

[‡]On a compact D -dimensional manifold without a boundary, any arbitrary differential form f_n of degree n (with $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots; 0 \leq n \leq D$), can be uniquely expressed as $f_n = h_n + de_{n-1} + \delta c_{n+1}$ where $(\delta)d$ ($\delta = \pm * d*$, $d = dx^\mu \partial_\mu$ with $\delta^2 = d^2 = 0$) are the (co)-exterior derivatives which define the Laplacian operator $\Delta = (\delta + d)^2 = \{\delta, d\}$. Here $*$ is the Hodge duality operator on the manifold and h_n is the harmonic form (i.e. $\Delta h_n = dh_n = \delta h_n = 0$). It will be noted that d and δ raise and lower the degree of a form by one, respectively. These cohomological operators satisfy the algebra: $d^2 = \delta^2 = 0$, $\Delta = \{d, \delta\}$, $[\Delta, d] = [\Delta, \delta] = 0$. This shows that Δ is the Casimir operator for the whole algebra [13-15].

theory. To demonstrate that the notoph gauge theory does provide such an interesting 4D model for the Hodge theory, we begin with the following (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian density ($\mathcal{L}_b$) [16,17]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_b &= \frac{1}{12}H_{\mu\nu\kappa}H^{\mu\nu\kappa} + B^\mu(\partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu\phi_1) - \frac{1}{2}B^\mu B_\mu - \partial_\mu\bar{\beta}\partial^\mu\beta \\ &+ (\partial_\mu\bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu\bar{C}_\mu)(\partial^\mu C^\nu) + \rho(\partial \cdot C + \lambda) + (\partial \cdot \bar{C} + \rho)\lambda,\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where B_μ, ϕ_1 are the bosonic auxiliary fields, ρ, λ are the scalar fermionic ($\rho^2 = \lambda^2 = 0, \rho\lambda + \lambda\rho = 0$) auxiliary (ghost) fields, $(\bar{C}_\mu)C_\mu$ are the fermionic ($C_\mu^2 = \bar{C}_\mu^2 = 0, C_\mu\bar{C}_\nu + \bar{C}_\nu C_\mu = 0$ etc.) vector (anti-)ghost fields and $(\bar{\beta})\beta$ are the bosonic (anti-)ghost fields. Here the kinetic energy term ($\frac{1}{12}H_{\mu\nu\kappa}H^{\mu\nu\kappa}$) is constructed (i.e. $H_{\mu\nu\kappa} = \partial_\mu B_{\nu\kappa} + \text{cyclic terms}$) from the antisymmetric gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$ of the 2-form field ($B = \frac{1}{2}(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)B_{\mu\nu}$) when it is acted upon by the exterior derivative d to generate a 3-form H (i.e. $H = dB = \frac{1}{3!}(dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\kappa)H_{\mu\nu\kappa}$). The above quadratic kinetic energy term can be linearized by introducing a massless ($\square\phi_2 = 0$) pseudo-scalar field ϕ_2 and an axial-vector auxiliary field $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ as [§]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_B &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}^\mu\mathcal{B}_\mu - \mathcal{B}^\mu(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\partial^\nu B^{\kappa\zeta} - \partial_\mu\phi_2) + B^\mu(\partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu\phi_1) - \frac{1}{2}B^\mu B_\mu \\ &- \partial_\mu\bar{\beta}\partial^\mu\beta + (\partial_\mu\bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu\bar{C}_\mu)(\partial^\mu C^\nu) + \rho(\partial \cdot C + \lambda) + (\partial \cdot \bar{C} + \rho)\lambda.\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

The obvious point, at this stage, is the fact that the massless ($\square\phi_2 = \square\phi_1 = 0$) (pseudo-)scalar fields (ϕ_2) ϕ_1 behave with each-other in the same manner as the dual antisymmetric field ($\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}B^{\kappa\zeta}$) behaves with $(B_{\mu\nu})$ in 4D. Furthermore, it is clear that for the Lagrangian density (2) to possess simultaneously the (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries, *the $B_{\mu\nu}$ field and its dual ϕ_2 field are required to be present together in it.* Under the following (i) local, covariant, continuous and off-shell nilpotent ($s_b^2 = 0$) BRST transformations

$$\begin{aligned}s_b B_{\mu\nu} &= (\partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu), & s_b C_\mu &= \partial_\mu\beta, & s_b\beta &= 0, & s_b\bar{C}_\mu &= B_\mu, \\ s_b\phi_1 &= -\lambda, & s_b\bar{\beta} &= \rho, & s_b(H_{\mu\nu\kappa}, \phi_2, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \rho, B_\mu, \lambda) &= 0,\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

and (ii) local, covariant, continuous off-shell nilpotent ($s_d^2 = 0$) dual(co-)BRST transformations

$$\begin{aligned}s_d B_{\mu\nu} &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\partial^\kappa\bar{C}^\zeta, & s_d\bar{C}_\mu &= -\partial_\mu\bar{\beta}, & s_d\bar{\beta} &= 0, & s_d C_\mu &= \mathcal{B}_\mu, \\ s_d\phi_2 &= -\rho, & s_d\beta &= \lambda, & s_d(\partial^\mu B_{\mu\nu}, \phi_1, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \rho, B_\mu, \lambda) &= 0,\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

the above Lagrangian density (2) transforms to some total derivatives. Furthermore, it can be checked that, under the following discrete symmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1 &\rightarrow \pm i\phi_2, & \phi_2 &\rightarrow \mp i\phi_1, & B_\mu &\rightarrow \pm i\mathcal{B}_\mu, \\ \mathcal{B}_\mu &\rightarrow \mp iB_\mu, & B_{\mu\nu} &\rightarrow \mp \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}B^{\kappa\zeta}, \\ C_\mu &\rightarrow \pm i\bar{C}_\mu, & \beta &\rightarrow \mp i\bar{\beta}, & \bar{\beta} &\rightarrow \pm i\beta, \\ \rho &\rightarrow \pm i\lambda, & \lambda &\rightarrow \pm i\rho, & \bar{C}_\mu &\rightarrow \pm iC_\mu,\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

[§]We follow here the convention and notations such that the flat metric $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1, -1)$ and the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor ($\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}$) is chosen to satisfy $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta} = -4!, \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\kappa\sigma} = -3!\delta_\zeta^\sigma$ etc. and $\varepsilon_{0123} = -\varepsilon^{0123} = +1, \varepsilon_{0ijk} = \epsilon_{ijk}$. Here the Greek indices $\mu, \nu, \dots = 0, 1, 2, 3$ correspond to the 4D spacetime directions on the manifold and the Latin indices $i, j, k, \dots = 1, 2, 3$ stand for the space directions. It should be noted that $(\partial \cdot C) = \partial_\mu C^\mu = \partial_0 C_0 - \partial_i C_i$ etc.

the Lagrangian density (2) remains invariant. This re-establishes the fact that the pairs (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) , $(B_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\mu)$ are *dual* to each-other on the same footing as $(B_{\mu\nu})$ and $(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}B^{\kappa\zeta})$ are dual to each-other. The key and distinguished features to be noted, at this stage, are (i) the ghost part of the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_g = -\partial_\mu\bar{\beta}\partial^\mu\beta + (\partial_\mu\bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu\bar{C}_\mu)(\partial^\mu C^\nu) + \rho(\partial\cdot C + \lambda) + (\partial\cdot\bar{C} + \rho)\lambda$, remains invariant in *itself* due to the discrete symmetry transformations on the (anti-)ghost fields of (5). On the contrary, the kinetic energy and the gauge-fixing terms $\mathcal{L}_{k.e.} + \mathcal{L}_{g.f.} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}^\mu\mathcal{B}_\mu - \mathcal{B}^\mu(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\partial^\nu B^{\kappa\zeta} - \partial_\mu\phi_2) + B^\mu(\partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu\phi_1) - \frac{1}{2}B^\mu B_\mu$ exchange with each-other under the discrete transformations (5). (ii) The substitution of the discrete transformations on the *ghost fields* (cf. (5)) lead to the derivation of the off-shell nilpotent ($s_{ab}^2 = s_{ad}^2 = 0$) anti-BRST and anti-co-BRST symmetry transformations from (3) and (4). (iii) Under the (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST transformations, it is the kinetic energy term (more precisely $H_{\mu\nu\kappa}$ in $H = dB$) and the gauge-fixing term (more accurately $\partial_\mu B^{\mu\nu}$ in $\delta B = \partial_\mu B^{\mu\nu}dx_\nu$) remain invariant, respectively. (iv) It can be seen that anticommutator of (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations is not zero and it defines a bosonic symmetry $s_w = \{s_b, s_d\} = \{s_{ad}, s_{ab}\}$, $s_w^2 \neq 0$ (see, e.g., [17] for details)

$$\begin{aligned} s_w B_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\zeta}\partial^\kappa B^\zeta, & s_w C_\mu &= \partial_\mu \lambda, \\ s_w(\phi_1, \phi_2, B_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \rho, \lambda, \beta, \bar{\beta}) &= 0, & s_w \bar{C}_\mu &= -\partial_\mu \rho, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

under which the Lagrangian density (2) transforms to a total derivative. The above bosonic symmetry transformation s_w is characterized by the fact that either the (anti-)ghost fields do not transform or they transform up to a vector gauge transformation. (v) There exist a global scale symmetry in the theory that corresponds to the ghost symmetry transformation. The infinitesimal version of this symmetry transformation (s_g) is

$$\begin{aligned} s_g B_{\mu\nu} &= s_g B_\mu = s_g \mathcal{B}_\mu = s_g \phi_1 = s_g \phi_2 = 0, & s_g C_\mu &= \Sigma C_\mu, & s_g \bar{C}_\mu &= -\Sigma \bar{C}_\mu, \\ s_g \rho &= -\Sigma \rho, & s_g \lambda &= \Sigma \lambda, & s_g \beta &= 2\Sigma \beta, & s_g \bar{\beta} &= -2\Sigma \bar{\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where Σ is a global (spacetime independent) parameter. There are no ghost scale transformations on the bosonic fields $B_{\mu\nu}, B_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \phi_1, \phi_2$ because they carry ghost number equal to zero. The ± 1 signs for the pairs $(C_\mu, \bar{C}_\mu)$ and (λ, ρ) are due to their ghost numbers being ± 1 . On the contrary, the factor of ± 2 in the above transformations for the pair $(\beta, \bar{\beta})$ is due to their ghost number being ± 2 . Thus, there are six local, covariant and continuous symmetries in the theory out of which four are nilpotent (i.e. $s_{g(b)}^2 = s_{g(a)d}^2 = 0$).

Now we would like to dwell a bit on the discrete symmetry transformations (5). These transformations correspond to the Hodge duality $*$ operation of the differential geometry in the following way. It can be checked the *an interplay* between the nilpotent continuous symmetries $(s_{(a)b}, s_{(a)d})$ and the discrete symmetry (5) leads to the following relationship

$$s_{(a)d} \Phi = \pm * s_{(a)b} * \Phi, \quad (8)$$

where Φ stands for the generic fields of the Lagrangian density (2) and $*$ corresponds to the transformations in (5). The $\pm$ signs in the above are dictated by the general requirement

for a duality invariant theory (see, e.g., [18] for details). Reduced to its simplest form, this requirement is equivalent to the implementation of a couple of successive $*$ (cf. equation (5)) operation on a specific field. The resulting signature in this operation leads to the determination of signs in (8). In mathematical terms, this requirement, for the Lagrangian density (2), is as follows

$$* (* \Phi) = \pm \Phi \quad \rightarrow \quad * (* B) = + B, \quad * (* F) = - F, \quad (9)$$

where $B = \beta, \bar{\beta}, \phi_1, \phi_2, B_{\mu\nu}, B_\mu, \mathcal{B}_\mu$ and $F = \rho, \lambda, C_\mu, \bar{C}_\mu$ and $*$ corresponds to the discrete transformations in (5). At this juncture, we compare and contrast between relationship (8) and the similar kind of relationship that exists in differential geometry. These are (i) the (co-)exterior derivatives $(\delta)d$ defined on a given D -dimensional manifold are related (i.e. $\delta = \pm * d*$) in exactly the same manner as $s_{(a)d}$ and $s_{(a)b}$ are related with each-other in (8). (ii) For the notoph gauge theory, the bosonic- and fermionic fields correspond to $\pm$ signs in (8), respectively (as is evident from our discussions before equation (9)). The $\pm$ signs in $\delta = \pm * d*$ is dictated by the dimensionality of the manifold. For instance, for an even dimensional manifold, there is always a negative sign on the r.h.s. of the relationship: $\delta = - * d*$ (see, e.g., [13] for details).

As noted earlier, there are six continuous symmetries for the 4D notoph gauge theory described by the (anti-)BRST- and (anti-)co-BRST invariant Lagrangian density (2). According to Noether's theorem, these symmetries lead to the derivation of a set of six local conserved charges (viz. $Q_{(a)b}, Q_{(a)d}, Q_w, Q_g$). The four conserved and nilpotent ($Q_{(a)b}^2 = Q_{(a)d}^2 = 0$) charges $Q_{(a)b}$ and $Q_{(a)d}$ (corresponding to the cohomological operators d and δ) generate the (anti-)BRST and (anti-)co-BRST symmetries. A bosonic symmetry generator $Q_w = \{Q_b, Q_d\} = \{Q_{ad}, Q_{ab}\}$ (that corresponds to the Laplacian operator) generate a bosonic symmetry transformation s_w . Finally, the conserved charge Q_g generates the scale transformations for the (anti-)ghost fields (cf. eqn. (7)). These generators, analogous to the algebra obeyed by the de Rham cohomological operators, follow the algebra as is given below

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(a)b}^2 = Q_{(a)d}^2 = 0, \quad Q_w = \{Q_d, Q_b\} = \{Q_{ab}, Q_{ad}\}, \quad \{Q_d, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \\ i[Q_g, Q_{b(ad)}] = +Q_{b(ad)}, \quad i[Q_g, Q_{d(ab)}] = -Q_{d(ab)}, \quad \{Q_b, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \\ [Q_w, Q_r] = 0, \quad r = b, ab, d, ad, w, g, \quad \{Q_b, Q_{ab}\} = 0, \quad \{Q_d, Q_{ab}\} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which shows that Q_w is the Casimir operator for the whole algebra. The above algebra implies that if the ghost number $(iQ_g|\Psi\rangle_n = n|\Psi\rangle_n)$ of a state $|\Psi\rangle_n$ is n , then the following relations ensue

$$\begin{aligned} iQ_g Q_{b(ad)} |\Psi\rangle_n &= (n+1) |\Psi\rangle_n, \\ iQ_g Q_{d(ab)} |\Psi\rangle_n &= (n-1) |\Psi\rangle_n, \\ iQ_g Q_w |\Psi\rangle_n &= (n) |\Psi\rangle_n, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which imply that the states $Q_{b(ad)}|\Psi\rangle_n, Q_{d(ab)}|\Psi\rangle_n$ and $Q_w|\Psi\rangle_n$ have the ghost number equal to $(n+1), (n-1)$ and n respectively. The above equation also implies that the

charges $Q_{b(ad)}$ and $Q_{d(ab)}$ raise and lower the ghost number of state by *one* respectively. This property is analogous to the operation of d and δ on a differential form of degree n . Thus, we have a “two-to-one” mapping between the conserved charges and the cohomological operators as: $Q_{b(ad)} \rightarrow d, Q_{d(ab)} \rightarrow \delta$ and $Q_w = \{Q_b, Q_d\} = \{Q_{ad}, Q_{ab}\} \rightarrow \Delta$. The above mapping is primarily due to (i) the identification of the degree of a form with the ghost number of a state, and (ii) the algebra obeyed by the conserved charges in (10). With the above identifications, the analogue of the celebrated Hodge decomposition theorem can be written, in the quantum Hilbert space of states, as

$$|\Psi\rangle_n = |\omega\rangle_n + Q_{b(ad)} |\theta\rangle_{n-1} + Q_{d(ab)} |\chi\rangle_{n+1}, \quad (12)$$

where n is the ghost number of an arbitrary state $|\Psi\rangle_n$ and $|\omega\rangle_n$ is the harmonic state (i.e. $Q_w|\omega\rangle_n = Q_{b(ad)}|\omega\rangle_n = Q_{d(ab)}|\omega\rangle_n = 0$). Thus, we have established that the notoph gauge theory, in the framework of an extended BRST formalism, does provide a beautiful field theoretical model for the Hodge theory where all the de Rham cohomological operators correspond to certain specific symmetry properties of the Lagrangian density (2).

To summarize, in our presentation, we have shown that the notoph gauge theory, proposed by Ogievetsky and Palubarinov [1,2], provides an interesting field theoretical model for the solution of the long-standing problem in the realm of BRST cohomology as, for this model, the analogues of the cohomological quantities $\delta, *$ and Δ do exist [17] in the language of local, covariant and continuous symmetry properties of the Lagrangian density (cf. equation (2)) of this theory. Furthermore, it is shown [19] that this field theoretical gauge theory is a model for the *quasi-topological* field theory in 4D where the topological invariants do exist and they obey the recursion relations that are characteristic features of an *exact* topological field theory. However, the Lagrangian density and symmetric energy-momentum of this theory are found *not* to be able to be expressed as the sum of BRST and co-BRST exact quantities. In addition, this model provides a fertile ground where Wigner’s little group plays a very crucial and decisive role in the discussion of the BRST cohomology and Hodge decomposition theorem in the quantum Hilbert space of states [20]. There are many interesting directions that can be pursued later. For instance, exploring the existence of the analogues of $\delta, *, \Delta$ for the *non-Abelian* version of the notoph gauge theory, study of its topological nature, its discussion in the framework of superfield formulation, etc., are open problems connected with the generalizations of the above 2-form Abelian gauge theory. Thus, we conclude that the notoph gauge theory and its possible generalizations are expected to be endowed with a very rich innate mathematical and physical structures which will enable them to remain the hot-bed of theoretical research in years to come. In particular, the higher dimensional theories will earnestly require them.

I wish to wrap up this presentation with a personal note of tribute to Professor V. I. Ogievetsky. I had the privilege and honour to work in his group “Problems in Supersymmetry” at JINR, Dubna during the later part of his life. His mere presence at JINR used to be an awe-inspiring experience for people of my generation. I owe a great deal to him for my *intellectual-lineage* as I worked with Prof. E. Ivanov, Prof. S. Krivonos and Prof.

A. Isaev at BLTP, JINR, Dubna. Prof. Ivanov is a direct student of Prof. Ogievetsky and Prof. Krivonos and Prof. Isaev have a whole range of research papers with Prof. Ivanov. Thus, I would remain grateful to Prof. Ogievetsky and others (who are his student and grand-students), throughout my life, for my intellectual debt.

References

- [1] V. I. Ogievetsky and I. V. Palubarinov, *Iad. Fiz* **4** (1966) 216.
- [2] V. I. Ogievetsky and I. V. Palubarinov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **4** (1967) 156.
- [3] See, e.g., A. Salam and E. Sezgin, *Supergravities in Diverse Dimensions* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
- [4] See, e.g., M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [5] See, e.g., J. Polchinski, *String Theory*, volumes 1 and 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998).
- [6] See, e.g., N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *JHEP* **09** (1999) 032.
- [7] M. Kalb and P. Ramond, *Phys. Rev. D* **9** (1974) 2273.
- [8] A. Vilenkin and T. Vachaspati, *Phys. Rev. D* **35** (1987) 1138.
- [9] R. L. Davis, *Phys. Rev. D* **40** (1989) 4033.
- [10] R. L. Davis, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **5** (1990) 955.
- [11] See, e.g., T. J. Allen, M. J. Bowick and A. Lahiri, *Phys. Lett. B* **237** (1989) 47.
- [12] See, e.g., E. Cremmer and J. Scherk, *Nucl. Phys. B* **72** (1974) 117.
- [13] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey and A. J. Hanson, *Phys. Rep.* **66** (1980) 213.
- [14] S. Mukhi and N. Mukunda, *Introduction to Topology, Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists*, (Wiley Eastern Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1990).
- [15] K. Nishijima, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **80** (1966) 897; 905.
- [16] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems* (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1992).
- [17] E. Harikumar, R. P. Malik and M. Sivakumar, *J. Phys. A: Math Gen* **33** (2000) 7149, hep-th/0004145.
- [18] S. Deser, A. Gomberoff, M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Phys. Lett. B* **400** (1997) 80.
- [19] R. P. Malik, *J. Phys. A: Math Gen* **36** (2003) 5095, hep-th/0209136.
- [20] R. P. Malik, *Gauge transformations, BRST cohomology and Wigner's little group*, hep-th/0212240 (To appear in *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **19** (2004)).